



**COMMUNISM IS TREASON!**

FIGHT IT WITH . . .

# Common Sense

**AMERICA'S NEWSPAPER AGAINST COMMUNISM**

Copyright Registered 1948 United States Patent Office.

**"The Truth, the whole Truth and nothing but the Truth!"**

Without fear or favor.

*Charles W. Bailey*  
FOUNDER AND EDITOR

**SUBSCRIPTION RATES:**

Plain envelope, unsealed .... \$1.

Plain envelope, sealed ..... \$3.

Foreign & Canada, (10 mos.) \$1.

Issue No. 381 (17th Year)

March 15, 1962

Second Class Postage Paid at Union, New Jersey, U.S.A.

**FIVE CENTS**

## Watch Out America - Katanga Could Be a Precedent!

By Merwin K. Hart

Republished from—

**National Economic Council Letter No. 518**

The American Government has outraged the American people—and the people of the world—by its full support of UN military operations against the law-abiding people of Katanga. American officials have vigorously encouraged the Acting Secretary General of the UN in his use of armed force in the Congo. We have supplied most of the money and the military transport planes, without which troops of the UN could not have carried on their operation against the African people. Is this stupidity? No.

Hasty efforts are now being made by our Government to cover up this pustulating sore, but we cannot permit American officials to do a "snow job" in this crisis.

Today's shocking developments in the Congo are the result of long-term policies of the American Government, followed for many years. These policies will not be abandoned. They will only be covered up. They are as desperately serious for the people of the United States as they are for the bewildered, hard-working farmers and miners of Katanga.

The Congo operation is a precedent for a long-established policy of the Planners in our Government and in the UN—the gradual disbanding of all nationalist military strength and the building up of UN armed forces. The objective—which has been openly stated again and again—is to make UN forces strong enough so that no national forces—not even American forces—can stand against them.

Where will that leave the independence of once-free nations? Just where Katanga is now. If the UN lays down a policy, and the people of any country do not like it, the UN will have the superiority in armed force which makes it possible to impose the policy against the wishes of the people of the area. If communists or pro-communists in power wish to impose their will, no resistance will be possible.

Where does that leave the United States? Just where it leaves Katanga—subject to a very real threat of future military intervention by an internationalist "police force," which can bomb hospitals and roads, seize radio stations and public buildings, and lay areas desolate in any country which questions the edicts of the UN.

Of course, such force will not be employed tomorrow or the next day. But the precedents are being built up with utmost care. Americans do not wish to believe this. But every step in the pattern is fully supported by the statements of the Planners themselves.

There is a powerful conservative uprising in the United States today. So far, it has not done anything. It has, it is true, warned the Planners to go slow. But it has not



Moise Tshombe

formulated any positive policies for which it can fight.

Here is an issue on which practically all conservatives can agree on a policy, and demand that Congress put it into effect. They should insist, first, as stated in our protest to the President, that the United States withdraw its military assistance and support of the UN in Katanga, and refuse all financial support to the UN if it does not desist.

The next essential step is to insist that the United States Government give no financial, logistical or other aid to any UN military operations anywhere. Then Congress should make it a matter of policy to give no legislative or financial support for any UN military force whatever.

Let us review what happened in Katanga, considered as a precedent.

The people of Katanga do not like the central government set-up in the Congo for two good reasons. First, the Adoula government is at best soft on communism. Known communists occupy several of the key positions in the party and governments. The communists do not need more than a few key positions in any government in order to be able to keep it pointed to the left.

Second, the people of Katanga do not want any strong central government over their province, even a good one. They have emphatically stated their preference for a Federal government (like our Constitutional government) in which the separate "states" of the nation shall be free to govern themselves with a few specific exceptions.

The American Government, in supporting the UN military operations against Katanga, thus put itself into the unbelievable position of fighting with pro-communists against the firmest anti-communists in Africa, and at the same time supporting centralization of government against the Federal principle

of self-determination. Could anything be more completely un-American?

If the people of Katanga do not want to be put under the heel of a pro-communist government, why should the United States interfere to compel them to bend to the yoke? If the people of Katanga do not want a strongly centralized government from a remote capital, why should the United States intervene to compel them to give up their liberties? It is not good enough to say this was stupidity. Which of the Planners is that stupid?

Katanga is one of the world's richest mineral-producing areas. It has highly developed mining and industry. It is one of the chief sources of employment and rising standards of living in all Africa.

We can imagine why Adoula and his communist advisers wanted to take over Katanga, and seize its wealth to divide it up with the rest of the Congo. We can understand why the Soviet Union did not wish to leave those minerals to an anti-communist leader. But why should the United States agree? Why should it condone bombing of hospitals and radio stations and firing on civilians, to compel the Katanganese to give up their higher living standards as well as their freedom? Stupidity is not the answer.

That isn't all. Every member nation in the UN was opposed to UN use of force in the Congo—except the Soviet Union and the United States. Our allies in NATO protested violently. Britain rescinded its decision to supply the UN forces with bombs. The African nations were not fooled by all the big words about UN intervention. Even Joseph Alsop, one of the most vigorous apologists for left-wing policies, said the plan to support Adoula was subject to two risks—one, the pro-communist influences around Congo Premier Adoula; the other, the possibility that "pacification" by the UN armies might leave Katanga a smoking ruin. The Africans know that. They do not want any more belligerence in Africa.

The American people have done themselves proud in their protests. From one end of the country to the other they have spoken out. "What right do we have to interfere in the internal affairs of any country? Why should Americans oppose firm anti-communists who are asking only for the rights enjoyed by our States in a Federal Union, formed to preserve as much local sovereignty as possible?"

It is significant that this uprising of Americans was not started by political leaders, but by people without position or political office. The press and radio were filled with pious double-talking explanations by officials, specious justifications for the amazing actions of our Government. But the talk did not fool anyone. The meaning of freedom under a Federal Union is still vivid in the minds of our people. They